

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

AMBER SUE MAJESTY,

Defendant and Appellant.

E054359

(Super.Ct.No. FSB026295)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Katrina West,
Judge. Affirmed.

Christian C. Buckley, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

On April 22, 2011, the acting medical director of Napa State Hospital requested
that the San Bernardino County District Attorney file a petition under Penal Code section

1026.5, subdivision (b), to extend the involuntary commitment of defendant and appellant Amber Sue Majesty. Defendant's maximum commitment date was November 18, 2011.

The requested petition was filed on May 16, 2011, and defendant denied the allegations. Defendant's presence for the proceedings and trial was waived by her counsel and a bench trial was requested. On July 12, 2011, the trial court found that defendant continued to meet the criteria for extended commitment under Penal Code section 1026.5, subdivision (b). The court, therefore, extended defendant's commitment until November 18, 2013. Defendant was not present at the trial based on her previous waiver. Defendant refused to be placed or considered for a conditional release program.

On August 25, 2011, defendant filed her notice of appeal.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Defendant was committed to Patton State Mental Hospital on July 7, 2000, based upon a judgment of "not guilty by reason of insanity" related to a charge that she solicited a man to kill her former husband.

At the extended commitment trial, Dr. Nader Wassef, one of defendant's treating psychiatrists, testified that defendant suffered from chronic paranoid schizophrenia that manifested in the form of thought disorders and delusions. According to the doctor, defendant denied having a mental illness and refused medication. Defendant was placed on a forced medication treatment plan for her condition; it was working. Dr. Wassef opined that defendant remained a substantial danger of physical harm to others because

of her continued denial and lack of insight into her mental illness, which was directly related to her criminal behavior, and because of her refusal to accept treatment.

Clinical psychologist Carol Humphreys testified that she regularly met with defendant who was beginning to improve but refused to work on a treatment or recovery plan. Defendant continued to exhibit delusional thinking and refused to admit that she had a mental disorder. Ms. Humphreys opined that defendant remained a substantial danger of physical harm to others because of her continued delusions and lack of commitment to treatment and medication.

ANALYSIS

After defendant appealed, and upon her request, this court appointed counsel to represent her. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, and potential arguable issues, and requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but she has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have conducted an independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

MCKINSTER
Acting P.J.

We concur:

RICHLI
J.

MILLER
J.